



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,657	09/16/2005	Stephen Terry Lang	040857/297610	7670
826	7590	01/28/2010	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP			MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H	
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA				
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			3774	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/549,657	LANG, STEPHEN TERRY	

All Participants:

Status of Application: AMDT after non-final rejection

(1) William H. Matthews (Howie).

(3) ____.

(2) Donald M. Hill, Jr.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2010

Time: 2PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Wagner under 102

Claims discussed:

1,3,17,19-23,27

Prior art documents discussed:

Wagner and 6517585/WO99/08621

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner explained that WO99/08621 (US6517585) was related to currently claimed subject matter, and Wagner was still applicable prior art. Examiner proposed amending claim 1 to include limitations of claim 3 and rotary piston or claim 5, amending claim 17 to include rotary piston and limitations of claims 19-21, amending claim 22 to include rotary piston and limitations of claim 23, and amending claim 27 to include rotary piston and limit the functional limitations to occur during flexion. The conversation did not immediately result in agreement or disagreement. On 1/22 Applicant's representative informed Examiner that Applicant was not amenable to the proposed amendments.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/William H. Matthews/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3774

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)